

**REMARKS**

Claim 43 is amended. No new claims are added. Claims 1-70 are pending for consideration. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS****35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-5 and 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,999,932 to Paul in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA), U.S. Patent No. 6,199,102 to Cobb, and U.S. Patent No. 6,618,747 to Flynn et al (hereinafter "Flynn").

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paul in view of AAPA, Cobb, Flynn, and U.S. Patent No. 5,459,717 to Mullan.

Claims 7-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paul in view of AAPA, Cobb, Flynn, and U.S. Patent No. 6,072,942 to Stockwell.

Claims 12-15, 24-27, 29, 30, 33-36, 38, 40 and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cobb in view of AAPA, Flynn, Stockwell '942, and U.S. Patent No. 6,199,103 to Sakaguchi et al (hereinafter "Sakaguchi").

Claims 16, 23, 31, and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cobb in view of AAPA, Flynn, Stockwell '942, Sakaguchi, and Mullan.

1 Claims 17 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being  
2 unpatentable over Cobb in view of AAPA, Stockwell '942, Sakaguchi, and Flynn.

3 Claims 18, 28, and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being  
4 unpatentable over Cobb in view of AAPA, Stockwell '942, Sakaguchi, and Paul.

5 Claims 19-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable  
6 over Sakaguchi in view of AAPA, Flynn, and Stockwell '942.

7 Claim 42 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable  
8 over Cobb in view of AAPA, Flynn, and Sakaguchi.

9 Claims 43-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable  
10 over Cobb in view of AAPA, Paul, Sakaguchi, and U.S. Patent No. 6,144,934 to  
11 Stockwell.

12 Claim 46 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable  
13 over Cobb in view of AAPA, Paul, Sakaguchi, Stockwell '934, and Mullan.

14 Claim 47 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable  
15 over Cobb in view of AAPA, Paul, Sakaguchi, Stockwell '934, and Stockwell  
16 '942.

17 Claims 48 and 52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being  
18 unpatentable over Paul in view of Flynn and AAPA.

19 Claim 49 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable  
20 over Paul in view of Flynn, AAPA, and Stockwell '942.

21 Claim 50 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable  
22 over Paul in view of Flynn and AAPA.

23 Claim 51 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable  
24 over Paul in view of Flynn, AAPA, and Mullan.  
25

1 Claims 53-57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable  
2 over Paul in view of Flynn and Cobb.

3 Claim 58 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable  
4 over Paul in view of Flynn, Cobb and Mullan.

5 Claims 59 and 60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being  
6 unpatentable over Paul in view of Flynn, Cobb, and Stockwell '942.

7 Claims 61-63 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable  
8 over Paul in view of Cobb and Flynn.

9 Claims 64-67 and 69 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being  
10 unpatentable over Cobb in view of Flynn, Stockwell '942, and Sakaguchi.

11 Claim 68 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable  
12 over Cobb in view of Flynn, Stockwell '942, Sakaguchi, and Mullan.

13 Claim 70 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable  
14 over Cobb in view of Flynn, Stockwell '942, Sakaguchi, and Paul.

15  
16 **The New Secondary Reference – Flynn**

17 Flynn discloses a system and method for a user to verify receipt of an e-  
18 mail message by an intended recipient. Rather than forwarding the email itself to  
19 the intended recipient, Flynn's system sends the recipient a notification message.  
20 The notification provides the recipient with a *unique electronic retrieval location*  
21 on a mail server, such as a unique IP address. If an attachment accompanies the  
22 email message, two unique IP addresses are provided, one for the email message  
23 itself and one for the attachment. The notification message may have additional  
24 information added to it prior to its delivery to the recipient. For example, the  
25

1 sender's name and/or email address may be added. Or, an advertisement may be  
2 added to the notification message.

3 Each recipient is provided with a *unique* address to retrieve their email  
4 even when the recipient is merely receiving a copy of an email that has been  
5 broadcast to a number of recipients. Flynn's system establishes one unique call  
6 address for *each copy* of the email sent to a plurality of intended recipients.

7 When the recipient retrieves the email and attachments from their  
8 respective addresses, Flynn's system notifies the sender that the email was  
9 retrieved. Or, where a plurality of recipients have been sent the same email, the  
10 sender may be notified only after all the recipients have retrieved their copies of  
11 the email.

### 12 13 Claims 1-11

14 **Claim 1** recites an email filtering method comprising [emphasis added]:

- 15 • defining at least one heuristic that determines whether an  
16 incoming email message likely constitutes unsolicited  
17 commercial email by considering an established pattern that such  
18 unsolicited commercial email typically exhibits when it is sent;
- 19 • applying said at least one heuristic to at least one email message  
20 that is received by a web server that comprises part of a web-  
21 based email system in which, for at least some users of the  
22 system, a client user interface email environment is generated  
23 through use of HTML or web pages; and
- 24 • redirecting said at least one email message if application of said  
25 at least one heuristic indicates that said at least one email  
message likely constitutes unsolicited commercial email,  
• wherein said redirecting comprises placing a copy of the email  
message at a location *not dedicated to storage of just one  
particular user's email*.

1 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office states that Paul in view  
2 of AAPA and Cobb does not teach placing a copy of the email message at a  
3 location not dedicated to storage of just one particular user's email. Applicant  
4 agrees. The Office then argues that Flynn discloses this feature. Applicant  
5 respectfully but strongly disagrees and traverses the Office's rejection.

6 In support of its position, the Office cites to column 2, lines 23-34 and 63-  
7 67, and column 3, lines 22-30, all of which are reproduced below [emphasis  
8 added]:

9 Only a notification that an email or an email plus an attachment is  
10 awaiting retrieval is sent to the recipient and appears at their  
11 computer. The notification provides the recipient with the *unique*  
12 *electronic retrieval location(s)*, such as a *unique* IP address for an  
13 email message or two unique email [sic] addresses for an email  
14 accompanied by an attachment, located on a mail server to which the  
15 recipient can direct their computer using software to retrieve the  
16 data-string(s). *Each recipient is provided with a unique address to*  
17 *retrieve their email even when the recipient is merely receiving a*  
18 *copy of an email that has been broadcast to a number of recipients.*  
19 *Col. 2, lines 23-34.*

20 . . . This message is simply a notice of the availability of the  
21 electronic communication that provides an electronic address such as  
22 a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) pointer to where the email is  
23 posted on the Web. *Col. 2, lines 63-67.*

24 . . . 1. Sending an electronic communication comprising a data-  
25 string.

2. Posting that data-string to a *unique* URL on a computer connected  
to the Web for each unique data-string.

3. Notifying the recipient at a recipient IP address via email that they  
have an electronic communication awaiting retrieval at a specified  
*unique* Web URL address. *Col. 3, lines 22-30.*

1 As discussed above and noted in the excerpts cited, Flynn discloses that its  
2 notification system provides the recipient with a *unique electronic retrieval*  
3 *location* on a mail server. Flynn stresses this point when it states that "[e]ach  
4 recipient is provided with a *unique* address to retrieve their email even when the  
5 recipient is merely receiving a *copy* of an email that has been broadcast to a  
6 number of recipients." In other words, Flynn's system redirects by placing a copy  
7 of the email message at a location that *is* dedicated to storage of just one particular  
8 user's email. Therefore, not only does Flynn fail to disclose or suggest the claimed  
9 subject matter, it *teaches directly away* from Applicant's claimed redirection  
10 feature. Accordingly, for at least this reason, this claim is allowable.

11 Claims 2-11 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are  
12 allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also  
13 allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited  
14 in claim 1, are neither disclosed nor taught by the references of record, either  
15 singly or in combination with one another. Given the allowability of these claims,  
16 the rejections of claim 6 over the combination with Mullan, and claim 7-8 over the  
17 combination with Stockwell '942, are not seen to add anything of significance.

18  
19 **Claims 12-18**

20 **Claim 12** recites an email filtering method comprising [emphasis added]:

- 21
- 22 • receiving an email message at an email server that maintains  
23 inboxes for individual recipients, wherein the email message is  
24 addressed to a plurality of recipients, the email server comprising  
25 part of an Internet-based email system in which, for at least some  
users of the system, a client user interface email environment is  
generated through use of HTML or web pages;

- calculating a score for the email message at the server location based upon at least one of (a) the size of the email message, and (b) the number of specified recipient addresses;
- comparing the score with a threshold value that defines a likelihood of whether an email message constitutes an unwanted email message;
- responsive to the email message exceeding the threshold value, placing a copy of the email message at a first location *other than an individual storage location dedicated to an individual intended recipient* of the email message; and
- sending a notification to the intended recipients that a copy of an email message that was intended for them has been placed at the first location.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office states that Cobb in view of AAPA does not teach placing a copy of the email message at a first location other than an individual storage location dedicated to an individual intended recipient of the email message. Applicant agrees. The Office then argues that Flynn discloses this feature. Applicant respectfully but strongly disagrees and traverses the Office's rejection.

In support of its position, the Office cites to column 2, lines 23-34 and 63-67, and column 3, lines 22-30, all of which were reproduced above.

As noted in the excerpts cited, Flynn discloses that its notification system provides the recipient with a *unique electronic retrieval location* on a mail server. Flynn stresses this point when it states that "[e]ach recipient is provided with a *unique* address to retrieve their email even when the recipient is merely receiving a *copy* of an email that has been broadcast to a number of recipients." In other words, Flynn's system places a copy of the email message at a location that *is* an individual storage location dedicated to an individual intended recipient. Therefore, not only does Flynn fail to disclose or suggest what the Office claims it does, Flynn *teaches directly away* from Applicant's claimed subject matter.

1 Additionally, the secondary references to Stockwell '942 and Sakaguchi neither  
2 disclose nor suggest the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, for at least this  
3 reason, this claim is allowable.

4 **Claims 13-18** depend from claim 12 and are allowable as depending from  
5 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited  
6 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 12, are neither disclosed  
7 nor taught by the references of record, either singly or in combination with one  
8 another. Given the allowability of these claims, the rejections of claim 16 over the  
9 combination with Mullan, and claim 18 over the combination with Paul, are not  
10 seen to add anything of significance.

11  
12 **Claims 19-23**

13 **Claim 19** recites a computer program stored on one or more computer  
14 readable media for processing email and comprising the following steps [emphasis  
15 added]:

- 16
- 17 • receiving an email message at a server location, the email  
18 message being addressed to a plurality of recipients, the  
19 server location comprising one or more servers that  
20 comprise part of an Internet-based email system in which,  
21 for at least some users of the system, a client user  
22 interface email environment is generated by the system  
23 through use of HTML or web pages that are sent via the  
24 Internet to client devices and used by a browser executing  
25 on a client device to render the user interface email  
environment;
  - placing *only one copy* of the email message at a first  
storage location that is *not a dedicated storage location*  
*for just one of the intended recipients*; and
  - notifying each of the intended recipients that an email  
message intended for them has been placed at the first  
location.



1 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office states that Sakaguchi in  
2 view of AAPA does not teach placing only one copy of the email message at a  
3 first storage location that is not a dedicated storage location for just one of the  
4 intended recipients. Applicant agrees. The Office then argues that Flynn discloses  
5 this feature. Applicant respectfully but strongly disagrees and traverses the  
6 Office's rejection.

7 In support of its position, the Office cites to column 2, lines 23-34 and 63-  
8 67, and column 3, lines 22-30, all of which were reproduced above.

9 As noted in the excerpts cited, Flynn discloses that its notification system  
10 provides the recipient with a *unique electronic retrieval location* on a mail server.  
11 Flynn stresses this point when it states that "[e]ach recipient is provided with a  
12 *unique* address to retrieve their email even when the recipient is merely receiving  
13 a *copy* of an email that has been broadcast to a number of recipients."  
14 Furthermore, Flynn's system establishes one unique call address for *each copy* of  
15 the email sent to a plurality of intended recipients. And, when a plurality of  
16 recipients have been sent the same email, Flynn's system dictates that the sender  
17 may be notified only after all the recipients have retrieved *their copies* of the  
18 email. In other words, Flynn's system places *multiple copies* of the email message  
19 at *multiple* storage locations that *are* dedicated storage locations for *each* of the  
20 intended recipients. Therefore, not only does Flynn fail to disclose or suggest what  
21 the Office claims it does, Flynn *teaches directly away* from Applicant's claimed  
22 subject matter by specifying that each recipient gets *his own copy* of the email at a  
23 *dedicated* storage location for *just that particular recipient*. Additionally, the  
24  
25

1 secondary reference to Stockwell '942 neither discloses nor suggests the claimed  
2 subject matter. Accordingly, for at least this reason, this claim is allowable.

3 **Claims 20-23** depend from claim 19 and are allowable as depending from  
4 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited  
5 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 19, are neither disclosed  
6 nor taught by the references of record, either singly or in combination with one  
7 another. Given the allowability of these claims, the rejection of claim 23 over the  
8 combination with Cobb and Mullan is not seen to add anything of significance.

9  
10 **Claims 24-33**

11 **Claim 24** recites a programmed email server that contains computer-  
12 readable instructions which, when executed by the email server, perform the  
13 following steps [emphasis added]:

- 14
- 15 • determining whether an email message that is received by the  
16 email server likely constitutes an unwanted email message, the  
17 email server comprising part of a web-based email system in  
18 which, for at least some users of the system, a client user  
19 interface email environment is generated through use of HTML  
20 or web pages that are sent to client devices; and
  - 21 • if the email message likely constitutes an unwanted email  
22 message:
  - 23 • storing a copy of the email message at a first storage location  
24 *rather than individual storage locations that are dedicated to*  
25 *individual intended recipients of the email message*; and
  - notifying intended recipients of the email message that an email  
message addressed to them has been received by the server.

23 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office states that Cobb in  
24 view of AAPA does not teach storing a copy of the email message at a first storage  
25

1 location rather than individual storage locations that are dedicated to individual  
2 intended recipients of the email message. Applicant agrees. The Office then argues  
3 that Flynn discloses this feature. Applicant respectfully but strongly disagrees and  
4 traverses the Office's rejection.

5 In support of its position, the Office cites to column 2, lines 23-34 and 63-  
6 67, and column 3, lines 22-30, all of which were reproduced above.

7 As noted in the excerpts cited, Flynn discloses that its notification system  
8 provides the recipient with a *unique electronic retrieval location* on a mail server.  
9 Flynn stresses this point when it states that "[e]ach recipient is provided with a  
10 *unique* address to retrieve their email even when the recipient is merely receiving  
11 a *copy* of an email that has been broadcast to a number of recipients." In other  
12 words, Flynn's system stores a copy of the email message at storage locations that  
13 *are* dedicated to individual intended recipients. Therefore, not only does Flynn fail  
14 to disclose or suggest what the Office claims it does, Flynn *teaches directly away*  
15 from Applicant's claimed subject matter. Additionally, the secondary references to  
16 Stockwell '942 and Sakaguchi neither disclose nor suggest the claimed subject  
17 matter. Accordingly, for at least this reason, this claim is allowable.

18 **Claims 25-33** depend from claim 24 either directly or indirectly and are  
19 allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also  
20 allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited  
21 in claim 24, are neither disclosed nor taught by the references of record, either  
22 singly or in combination with one another. Given the allowability of these claims,  
23 the rejections of claim 28 over the combination with Paul, and 31-32 over the  
24 combination with Mullan, are not seen to add anything of significance.

Claims 34-39

Claim 34 recites an email screening method comprising [emphasis added]:

- developing a profile of unsolicited commercial email based upon the size of an email message and the number of specified recipient addresses of the email message;
- configuring a mail server that is responsible for storing and distributing email messages to a plurality of clients with a filter processor that is programmed to evaluate email messages that are received in light of the developed profile, the mail server comprising part of a web-based email system in which, for at least some users of the system, a client user interface email environment is generated through use of HTML or web pages that are sent to client devices;
- evaluating email messages with the filter processor and determining whether the email messages fit the developed profile; and
- if an email message fits the developed profile, initiating a remedial measure that ensures that the mail server *does not make as many copies of the email message as there are specified recipient addresses*, yet still allows the email message to be accessible to at least one recipient.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office states that Cobb in view of AAPA does not teach if an email message fits the developed profile, initiating a remedial measure that ensures that the mail server does not make as many copies of the email message as there are specified recipient addresses. Applicant agrees. The Office then argues that Flynn discloses this feature. Applicant respectfully but strongly disagrees and traverses the Office's rejection.

In support of its position, the Office cites to column 2, lines 23-34 and 63-67, and column 3, lines 22-30, all of which were reproduced above.

As noted in the excerpts cited, Flynn discloses that its notification system provides the recipient with a *unique electronic retrieval location* on a mail server.

1 Flynn stresses this point when it states that "[e]ach recipient is provided with a  
2 *unique* address to retrieve their email even when the recipient is merely receiving  
3 a *copy* of an email that has been broadcast to a number of recipients."  
4 Furthermore, Flynn's system establishes one unique call address for *each copy* of  
5 the email sent to a plurality of intended recipients. And, when a plurality of  
6 recipients have been sent the same email, Flynn's system dictates that the sender  
7 may be notified only after all the recipients have retrieved *their copies* of the  
8 email. In other words, Flynn's system initiates *no* remedial measure, but rather  
9 makes *just as many copies* of the email message as there are specified recipient  
10 addresses. Therefore, not only does Flynn fail to disclose or suggest what the  
11 Office claims it does, Flynn *teaches directly away* from Applicant's claimed  
12 subject matter by specifying that, *regardless of the number of specified recipient*  
13 *addresses of a particular email*, a separate copy is made for *each and every*  
14 recipient address. Additionally, the secondary references to Stockwell '942 and  
15 Sakaguchi neither disclose nor suggest the claimed subject matter. Accordingly,  
16 for at least this reason, this claim is allowable.

17 **Claims 35-39** depend either directly or indirectly from claim 34 and are  
18 allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also  
19 allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited  
20 in claim 34, are neither disclosed nor taught by the references of record, either  
21 singly or in combination with one another. Given the allowability of these claims,  
22 the rejection of claim 39 over the combination with Paul is not seen to add  
23 anything of significance.

Claims 40-41

Claim 40 recites an email delivery method comprising [emphasis added]:

- establishing a bulk email folder in which bulk email is to be stored;
- configuring an email server to receive email messages and deliver them *either* to multiple server storage locations that are dedicated to storing email messages for respective recipients *or to a single, shared location that can be shared by a plurality of the recipients*, the email server comprising part of an email system in which, for at least some users of the system, a client user interface email environment is generated through use of HTML or web pages that are sent to client devices;
- receiving an email message;
- comparing an address for the sender of the email message with a recipient's list of approved senders; and
- *delivering the email message to the single, shared location* if:  
(a) the email message is not directly addressed to a recipient that is serviced by the server, and (b) the sender's address does not appear in the recipient's list of approved senders.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office states that Cobb in view of AAPA does not teach an email server to receive email messages and deliver them to a single, shared location that can be shared by a plurality of the recipients. Applicant agrees. The Office then argues that Flynn discloses this feature. Applicant respectfully but strongly disagrees and traverses the Office's rejection.

In support of its position, the Office cites to column 2, lines 23-34 and 63-67, and column 3, lines 22-30, all of which were reproduced above

As noted in the excerpts cited, Flynn discloses that its notification system provides the recipient with a *unique electronic retrieval location* on a mail server. Flynn stresses this point when it states that "[e]ach recipient is provided with a *unique* address to retrieve their email even when the recipient is merely receiving

1 a *copy* of an email that has been broadcast to a number of recipients.”

2 Furthermore, Flynn’s system establishes one unique call address for *each copy* of  
3 the email sent to a plurality of intended recipients. And, when a plurality of  
4 recipients have been sent the same email, Flynn’s system dictates that the sender  
5 may be notified only after all the recipients have retrieved *their copies* of the  
6 email. In other words, Flynn’s system is configured to deliver email messages *only*  
7 to multiple server storage locations that are dedicated to storing email messages  
8 for respective recipients. Flynn’s system is *not* configured to deliver email  
9 messages to a *single, shared location that can be shared by a plurality of the*  
10 *recipients*. Therefore, not only does Flynn fail to disclose or suggest what the  
11 Office claims it does, Flynn *teaches directly away* from Applicant’s claimed  
12 subject matter. Additionally, the secondary references to Stockwell ‘942 and  
13 Sakaguchi neither disclose nor suggest the claimed subject matter. Accordingly,  
14 for at least this reason, this claim is allowable.

15 Claim 41 depends from claim 40 and is allowable as depending from an  
16 allowable base claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features  
17 which, in combination with those recited in claim 40, are neither disclosed nor  
18 taught by the references of record, either singly or in combination with one  
19 another.

20  
21 **Claim 42**

22 Claim 42 recites an email screening method comprising [emphasis added]:

- 23 • developing a profile of unwanted email messages based upon  
24 whether an email message is similar in content to another email  
25 message;

- 1 • configuring a mail server that is responsible for storing email  
2 messages for a plurality of clients with a filter processor that is  
3 programmed to evaluate email messages that are received in light  
4 of the developed profile, the mail server comprising part of an  
5 email system in which, for at least some users of the system, a  
6 client user interface email environment is generated through use  
7 of HTML or web pages that are sent to client devices;
- 8 • evaluating email messages with the filter processor and  
9 determining whether the email message fits the developed  
10 profile; and
- 11 • if the email message fits the developed profile, placing a copy of  
12 the email message in a first location and, *rather than placing*  
13 *multiple copies of the email message in multiple dedicated*  
14 *client storage locations*, notifying the multiple clients that an  
15 email message addressed to them has been received so that the  
16 clients can read the email message if they so desire.

17 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office states that Cobb in  
18 view of AAPA does not teach configuring a mail server that is responsible for  
19 storing email messages for a plurality of clients and if the email message fits the  
20 developed profile, placing a copy of the email message in a first location and,  
21 rather than placing multiple copies of the email message in multiple dedicated  
22 client storage locations. Applicant agrees. The Office then argues that Flynn  
23 discloses this feature. Applicant respectfully but strongly disagrees and traverses  
24 the Office's rejection.

25 In support of its position, the Office cites to column 2, lines 23-34 and 63-  
67, and column 3, lines 22-30, all of which were reproduced above.

As noted in the excerpts cited, Flynn discloses that its notification system  
provides the recipient with a *unique electronic retrieval location* on a mail server.  
Flynn stresses this point when it states that "[e]ach recipient is provided with a  
*unique* address to retrieve their email even when the recipient is merely receiving  
a *copy* of an email that has been broadcast to a number of recipients."



1 Furthermore, Flynn's system establishes one unique call address for *each copy* of  
2 the email sent to a plurality of intended recipients. And, when a plurality of  
3 recipients have been sent the same email, Flynn's system dictates that the sender  
4 may be notified only after all the recipients have retrieved *their copies* of the  
5 email. In other words, Flynn's system *does* place *multiple copies* of the email  
6 message in *multiple dedicated* client storage locations. Therefore, not only does  
7 Flynn fail to disclose or suggest what the Office claims it does, Flynn *teaches*  
8 *directly away* from Applicant's claimed subject matter. Additionally, the  
9 secondary reference to Sakaguchi neither discloses nor suggests the claimed  
10 subject matter. Accordingly, for at least this reason, this claim is allowable.

#### 11 12 Claims 43-47

13 **Claim 43** recites an email screening method comprising [emphasis added]:

- 14 • *defining an index having values that are assigned to various*  
15 *degrees of desirability* that an email message can have, wherein  
16 the degrees of desirability extend from a low degree of  
17 desirability to a high degree of desirability;
- 18 • associating a plurality of parameters having parameter values  
19 with the various degrees of desirability, wherein at least some of  
20 the parameters do not depend on any message that is conveyed  
21 by any content of an email message;
- 22 • establishing a user interface through which a user can adjust  
23 either (a) individual parameter values that, in turn, establish a  
24 degree of desirability, or (b) index values that themselves  
25 establish a degree of desirability that email messages must have  
in order to be saved to dedicated user storage locations; and
- evaluating, using a computing device comprising part of an email  
system in which, for at least some users of the system, a client  
user interface email environment is generated through use of  
HTML or web pages that are sent to client devices, incoming  
email messages against the index value that is defined by the  
user.

1 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office states that Cobb in  
2 view of AAPA and Paul does not teach evaluating incoming email messages  
3 against the index value that is defined by the user. Applicant agrees. The Office  
4 then argues that Sakaguchi teaches the following:

- 5 • defining an index having values that are assigned to various degrees  
6 of desirability that an email message can have, wherein the degrees  
7 of desirability extend from a low degree of desirability to a high  
8 degree of desirability;
- 9 • establishing a user interface through which a user can adjust either  
10 (a) individual parameters that, in turn, establish a degree of  
11 desirability, that email messages must have in order to be saved; and  
12 • evaluating incoming email messages against the index value that is  
13 defined by the user.

14 The Office cites to column 6, lines 28-29, and column 6, line 56, through  
15 column 7, line 5, to support its argument. Those excerpts are reproduced below:

16 The user can also see the data stored in the estimated junk electronic  
17 mail storage section 6 . . . Col. 6, lines 28-29.

18 This process is repeated for all the junk electronic mail  
19 determination conditions and the total value is adopted as the junk  
20 degree of the electronic mail being evaluated at step ST2.

21 Whether or not the found junk degree exceeds a preset threshold  
22 value is determined at step ST3. If the junk degree does not exceed  
23 the threshold value, the similarity to the determination conditions  
24 prepared based on junk electronic mail is low and thus the possibility  
25 that the electronic mail may be non-junk electronic mail is high.  
Then, the electronic mail is determined estimated non-junk  
electronic mail at step ST4. On the other hand, if the junk degree  
exceeds the threshold value, the similarity to the determination  
conditions prepared based on junk electronic mail is high and thus

the possibility that the electronic mail may be junk is high. Then, the electronic mail is determined estimated junk electronic mail at step ST5. Col. 6, line 56, through col. 7, line 5.

Applicant respectfully but strongly disagrees with the Office's argument and traverses the Office's rejection. Sakaguchi does not disclose defining an index, as Applicant has defined and used that term in its specification. In order to aid the Office's understanding of the claimed subject matter, the Office is respectfully referred to page 17, line 12, through page 19, line 4, of the specification. That excerpt is set forth below [emphasis added]:

#### Desirability Index

In one embodiment, the concept of a desirability index is used to assess email messages. Fig. 7 shows one such exemplary index at 300. *The idea behind the desirability index is that index values, here 1-7, are assigned to various degrees of desirability that an email message can have.* The degrees of desirability range from a low desirability value of 1 to a high desirability value of 7. *The index values are associated with a plurality of parameters having parameter values.* For exemplary purposes only, Table 2 sets forth the index values that are cross-referenced against some example parameters.

Table 2

Index Values	Number of specified recipient addresses	Percentage of invalid specified recipient addresses	Larger than X bytes	Delivery time
1	>1000	>20%	>X	Between 11:30 P.M. and 3:30 A.M.
2	$0 < y \leq 200$	>10%	>X	Between 10:00 P.M. and 12:00 P.M.
3	$0 < y \leq 150$	5-15%	>X	Daytime
4	$0 < y \leq 100$	5-10%	<X	Daytime
5	$\leq 30$	0-10%	<X	Daytime
6	$\leq 20$	0-5%	<X	Daytime
7	$\leq 20$	0-3%	<X	Daytime

The parameters in this example include: the number of specified recipient addresses, the percentage of invalid specified recipient addresses, a size parameter, and a delivery time parameter. *The parameters each have values that correspond to the various index*

1 *values.* Some of the parameters do not depend on any message  
2 conveyed by any content of an email message. The parameter  
3 values are preferably adjustable so that different patterns of delivery  
4 can be examined.

5 Fig. 8 shows a user interface 302 that can be used in connection with  
6 desirability index 300. The user interface 302 is established so that a  
7 user, client, or recipient can adjust either or both of the individual  
8 parameter values or the index values. *If the user adjusts a  
9 parameter value, then the index value associated with a certain  
10 degree of desirability is made either more or less restrictive. If the  
11 user adjusts the index value, then the user changes the degree of  
12 desirability.* The email server then uses the *selected index value* to  
13 assess and evaluate incoming email messages for the user.

14 For example, when an email message is received at the server  
15 location, a score can be calculated based upon one or more of the  
16 parameters. Any number or combination of parameters can be used.  
17 In addition, parameters other than those specifically shown can be  
18 used. *The score is then compared with an index value that is  
19 selected by a user or recipient. In this manner, the user-selected  
20 index value represents a threshold value.* The index or threshold  
21 value defines a likelihood that a particular email message will  
22 constitute an unwanted email message. If an email message's score  
23 exceeds the threshold value (here, in the negative direction), then the  
24 email message likely constitutes one that a user or recipient does not  
25 want. If this is the case, the server can then place a copy of the  
email message at storage location 44 (Fig. 5) and send notifications  
to the intended recipients.

19 As shown above, particularly in Table 2, Applicant's index value is an  
20 *abstraction* of a group of one or more parameters. For a given piece of email, a  
21 score can be calculated based upon the one or more parameters. Both parameter  
22 values and index values can be adjusted by the user. The score is then compared  
23 with the *index value* that is selected by a user or recipient to determine whether  
24 the email likely constitutes an unwanted message.

1 In contrast, Sakaguchi's system generates a junk degree based upon  
2 extracted keywords. If the junk degree exceeds a pre-set threshold, the mail is  
3 determined estimated junk electronic mail. Applicant respectfully submits that  
4 Sakaguchi does not teach or suggest defining an index, as that term is defined and  
5 used by Applicant. Rather, Sakaguchi's system is based upon a single *parameter*.  
6 Applicant's Table 2 contains several examples of parameters. For example, if the  
7 number of specified recipient addresses of a particular email is 25, the associated  
8 index value would be 5. In Applicant's system, incoming email messages are  
9 evaluated against the *index value* defined by the user. Therefore, if the user selects  
10 an index value of 6 as a threshold, the email likely constitutes unwanted email  
11 because index value 5 is less than selected index value 6. However, if the user  
12 selects an index value of 4, the email likely does not constitute unwanted email  
13 because index value 5 is greater than selected index value 4. If Sakaguchi were to  
14 use the same parameter (which it does not), it would compare the parameter value  
15 of 25 with the threshold value of 30. Sakaguchi's system would then immediately  
16 label the email as estimated junk electronic mail or estimated nonjunk electronic  
17 mail with no further abstraction from parameter value to index value.

18 Accordingly, for at least this reason, this claim is allowable.

19 **Claims 44-47** depend from claim 43 and are allowable as depending from  
20 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited  
21 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 43, are neither disclosed  
22 nor taught by the references of record, either singly or in combination with one  
23 another. Given the allowability of these claims, the rejection of claim 46 in  
24 combination with Mullan is not seen to add anything of significance.

Claims 48-52

Claim 48 recites an email server system comprising [emphasis added]:

- a user storage database configured to store user information including email messages that are intended for individual users; and
- a server configured to receive email messages that are intended for various users and store the email messages in dedicated user storage locations within the user storage database;
- wherein the server is further configured to screen email messages based upon a set of heuristics that determine whether an email message likely constitutes an unwanted email message, the server further being configured to place a *single copy* of an email message in a storage location that is *not a dedicated user storage location* if it is determined by screening the email message that it likely constitutes an unwanted email message, said system comprising an Internet-based system that is configured to send email messages to users in a format in which a user's browser application processes the email messages and provides a user interface for a user to view the email messages.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office states that Paul does not teach placing a single copy of an email message in a storage location that is not a dedicated user storage location. Applicant agrees. The Office then argues that Flynn discloses this feature. Applicant respectfully but strongly disagrees and traverses the Office's rejection.

In support of its position, the Office cites to column 2, lines 23-34 and 63-67, and column 3, lines 22-30, all of which were reproduced above.

As noted in the excerpts cited, Flynn discloses that its notification system provides the recipient with a *unique electronic retrieval location* on a mail server. Flynn stresses this point when it states that "[e]ach recipient is provided with a *unique* address to retrieve their email even when the recipient is merely receiving a *copy* of an email that has been broadcast to a number of recipients."

1 Furthermore, Flynn's system establishes one unique call address for *each copy* of  
2 the email sent to a plurality of intended recipients. And, when a plurality of  
3 recipients have been sent the same email, Flynn's system dictates that the sender  
4 may be notified only after all the recipients have retrieved *their copies* of the  
5 email. In other words, Flynn's system is configured to place *multiple copies* of an  
6 email message in storage locations that *are* dedicated user storage locations.  
7 Therefore, not only does Flynn fail to disclose or suggest what the Office claims it  
8 does, Flynn *teaches directly away* from Applicant's claimed subject matter.  
9 Accordingly, for at least this reason, this claim is allowable.

10 **Claims 49-52** depend from claim 48 and are allowable as depending from  
11 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited  
12 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 48, are neither disclosed  
13 nor taught by the references of record, either singly or in combination with one  
14 another. Given the allowability of these claims, the rejections of claim 49 over the  
15 combination with Stockwell '942, claim 50 over the combination with Cobb, and  
16 claim 51 over the combination with Mullan, are not seen to add anything of  
17 significance.

18  
19 **Claims 53-57**

20 **Claim 53** recites an email filtering method comprising [emphasis added]:

- 21
- 22 • defining at least one heuristic that determines whether an incoming  
23 email message likely constitutes unsolicited commercial email by  
24 considering an established pattern that such unsolicited commercial  
25 email typically exhibits when it is sent;
  - applying said at least one heuristic to at least one email message; and
  - redirecting said at least one email message if application of said at  
least one heuristic indicates that said at least one email message

likely constitutes unsolicited commercial email, wherein said redirecting comprises placing a copy of the email message at a location *not dedicated to storage of just one particular user's email*.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office states that Paul does not teach placing a copy of the email message at a location not dedicated to storage of just one particular user's email. Applicant agrees. The Office then argues that Flynn discloses this feature. Applicant respectfully but strongly disagrees and traverses the Office's rejection.

In support of its position, the Office cites to column 2, lines 23-34 and 63-67, and column 3, lines 22-30, all of which were reproduced above.

As noted in the excerpts cited, Flynn discloses that its notification system provides the recipient with a *unique electronic retrieval location* on a mail server. Flynn stresses this point when it states that "[e]ach recipient is provided with a *unique* address to retrieve their email even when the recipient is merely receiving a *copy* of an email that has been broadcast to a number of recipients." In other words, Flynn's system redirects by placing a copy of the email message at a location that *is* dedicated to storage of just one particular user's email. Therefore, not only does Flynn fail to disclose or suggest the claimed subject matter, it *teaches directly away* from Applicant's claimed redirection feature. Additionally, the secondary reference to Cobb neither discloses nor suggests the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, for at least this reason, this claim is allowable.

Claims 54-63 depend from claim 53 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 53, are neither disclosed nor taught by the references of record, either singly or in combination with one



1 another. Given the allowability of these claims, the rejections of claim 58 over the  
2 combination with Mullan, and claim 59 over the combination with Stockwell '942,  
3 are not seen to add anything of significance.

4  
5 **Claims 64-70**

6 **Claim 64 recites an email filtering method comprising [emphasis added]:**

- 7
- 8 • receiving an email message at an email server that maintains inboxes  
9 for individual recipients;
  - 10 • calculating a score for the email message at the server location based  
11 upon at least one of (a) the size of the email message, and (b) the  
12 number of specified recipient addresses;
  - 13 • comparing the score with a threshold value that defines a likelihood  
14 of whether an email message constitutes an unwanted email  
15 message;
  - 16 • responsive to the email message exceeding the threshold value,  
17 placing a copy of the email message at a first location *other than an*  
18 *individual storage location dedicated to an individual intended*  
19 *recipient* of the email message; and
  - 20 • sending a notification to the intended recipients that a copy of an  
21 email message that was intended for them has been placed at the first  
22 location.

23 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office states that Cobb does  
24 not teach placing a copy of the email message at a first location other than an  
25 individual storage location dedicated to an individual intended recipient of the  
email message. Applicant agrees. The Office then argues that Flynn discloses this  
feature. Applicant respectfully but strongly disagrees and traverses the Office's  
rejection.

In support of its position, the Office cites to column 2, lines 23-34 and 63-  
67, and column 3, lines 22-30, all of which were reproduced above.

1 As noted in the excerpts cited, Flynn discloses that its notification system  
2 provides the recipient with a *unique electronic retrieval location* on a mail server.  
3 Flynn stresses this point when it states that "[e]ach recipient is provided with a  
4 *unique* address to retrieve their email even when the recipient is merely receiving  
5 a *copy* of an email that has been broadcast to a number of recipients." In other  
6 words, Flynn's system places a copy of the email message at a location that *is* an  
7 individual storage location dedicated to an individual intended recipient.  
8 Therefore, not only does Flynn fail to disclose or suggest what the Office claims it  
9 does, Flynn *teaches directly away* from Applicant's claimed subject matter.  
10 Additionally, the secondary references to Stockwell '942 and Sakaguchi neither  
11 disclose nor suggest the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, for at least this  
12 reason, this claim is allowable.

13 **Claims 65-70** depend from claim 64 and are allowable as depending from  
14 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited  
15 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 64, are neither disclosed  
16 nor taught by the references of record, either singly or in combination with one  
17 another. Given the allowability of these claims, the rejections of claim 68 over the  
18 combination with Mullan, and claim 70 over the combination with Paul, are not  
19 seen to add anything of significance.

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1  
2 **Conclusion**

3 All of the claims are in condition for allowance and Applicant respectfully  
4 requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the next anticipated  
5 action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant  
6 respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.  
7

8 Respectfully Submitted,

9  
10 Dated: 4/15/04

By: 

Lance R. Sadler  
Reg. No. 38,605  
(509) 324-9256  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25